

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested in view of the following remarks.

Initially, Applicants have amended paragraph [0121]. The Examiner will note that Applicants have amended formulae 8 and 9 to correct an obvious typographical error, specifically, " $|H(f)|_{\text{mix}}$ " have been amended to " $|H(f)|_{\text{min}}$ ".

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-3, 8-10 and 13-14 are rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by Meredith. (USP 6,310,579). Applicants traverse this rejection.

In addition to the original recitation, independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "the leakage signal is determined from an average sum of the absolute maximum powers and the absolute minimum powers of the received signal, and the reflected signal is determined from an average difference of the absolute maximum powers and the absolute minimum powers of the received signal."

Meredith on the hand teaches determining a return loss of an antenna by a calibration method. The calibration method including providing a first calibration signal to a coupler, measuring a first reflected signal without the antenna connected, connecting the antenna, providing a second calibration signal, and then

By comparing the signal voltage reflected from the antenna to the voltage reflected under the open or short circuit condition, one can complete the ant [sic] return loss as:

$$\text{Return Loss} = (V_{\text{ANT}}/V_{\text{OPEN}})^2. \text{ Column 5, lines 9-14.}$$

Although Meredith may teach a peak 207 and a minimum 208 of output signal 200, it does not teach that “the leakage signal is determined from an average sum of the absolute maximum powers and the absolute minimum powers of the received signal, and the reflected signal is determined from an average difference of the absolute maximum powers and the absolute minimum powers of the received signal” as recited in independent claims 1 and 13. Meredith fails to suggest or teach all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 13.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 13 are patentable over Meredith. Dependent claims 2, 3, 8-10 and 14 are also patentable for respectively depending on an allowable base claim.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4-7 and 11-12 are rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meredith.

As discussed above, independent claim 1 is patentable over Meredith. Accordingly, without acquiescing to the Examiner’s allegations, Applicants submit that dependent claims 4-7 and 11-12 are also patentable for depending on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of the rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Reg NO
45,261

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/LYP:psy